

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/431,699	DEMARCKEN, CARL G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert D. Rines	3626	

All Participants:

(1) Robert D. Rines.

(2) Denis Moloney (Reg. # 29670).

Status of Application: _____

(3) Jeffery A. Smith SPE A.U. 3625.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 September 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

13, 21, and 44

Prior art documents discussed:

Demarcken (US 6,377,932), DeMarcken et al.(US 6,295,521), Karch (US 6,442,537)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed patentability of claims 13, 21, and 44 over the above listed DeMarcken and Karch references. Discussed applicant's diversity-based travel option identification and refining process in contrast to the graphing and plotting approach disclosed in DeMarcken. Examiner and applicant's representative reached agreement that claims 13, 21, and 44 were patentable over the closest prior art (DeMarcken) in view of Applicant's persuasive remarks, presented in the Appeal Brief filed 22 november 2004 directed to differentiating the search strategy of the instant application in contrast to that disclosed in the Demarcken reference. Further Applicant agreed to cancel claims 26-43 and 46 to expediate the issuing of the case.